

# TIPPECANOE COUNTY AREA PLAN COMMISSION

## CITIZEN PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

DATE.....September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2003.  
TIME.....2:00 PM  
PLACE.....Grand Prairie Room  
Tippecanoe County Office Building

### ATTENDEES

#### NAME

Steve Clevenger  
Geneva Werner  
Sarah Ellison  
Paul Slavens

#### ORGANIZATION

Citizen  
Vinton Neighborhood  
Chamber of Realtors  
Tippecanoe School Corp.

#### STAFF

Doug Poad  
Brian Weber  
Margy Deverall

Senior Planner—Transportation  
Transportation Planner  
Assistant Director

### **I. APPROVAL OF THE MAY MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes were approved as distributed.

### **II. FEEDBACK & DISCUSSION FROM GROUP REPRESENTATIVES**

**Doug Poad** handed out the list of “hot spot” traffic locations that the CPC members put together at the April and July meetings. That list was passed on to the Technical Transportation Committee and INDOT.

**Doug** went over the list. The first one was about the right turn lane on Teal Road to US 52. Since the intersection of Teal with Concord Road is so close by, motorists waiting on Concord Road cannot determine whether others are turning onto US 52 or Concord Road. The second item was the left turn lane on Southbound Creasy to Eastbound SR 26; this lane is too short for the amount of traffic there. **Doug** mentioned that Staff is awaiting the completion of the SR 26/SR 38 Corridor Study. **Steve Clevenger** said that lane is not too short, but the traffic is too heavy for it.

The third item on the list involved a thank-you for installing a left-turn arrow at US 52 and Brady/Creasy Lane. Another item is the timing and synchronization of the signals on US 52 and Salisbury and Nighthawk Drive; drivers tend get stopped at either or both lights.

The next item is the left turn lane on US 52 at Greenbush and Union. Since that lane is too short, people are using the median. Doug mentioned that the INDOT Crawfordsville District director, when reviewing this list, experienced the same problem.

The list included another thank-you for the landscaped medians on US 52 south of SR 26. **Doug** mentioned that the list included a request to put more in, not only to complete the area south of SR 26, but north as well.

The seventh item involved the northbound merging lanes where US 52 and US 231 meet in West Lafayette. The eighth item is at US 52 and McCarty Lane where the time for the left arrow is too short for many cars to turn.

The ninth item was a request for a moratorium on traffic signals. **Doug** said that the INDOT district director agreed in principle. The last item was the apparent change in signal timing on SR 26 from Frontage Road westward, especially at the post office.

**Doug** mentioned that this list was presented to INDOT's annual district meeting on August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003. **Steve** brought up the issue of the signal synchronization on US 52 at Cumberland, Win Hentschel, and Morehouse. It is difficult to get through them without stopping at least twice. Discussion followed.

**Steve** mentioned that South and Columbia Streets have some of the best signal synchronization in the city. One problem elsewhere is that if you're three cars back, the next light will turn red right in front of you. Discussion followed.

**Paul Slavens** asked whether the rezoned Alcoa property had been sold yet. Doug replied that it had. **Brian Weber** mentioned that the Technical Transportation Committee has approved the design concept for entrances onto US 52 and Teal Road. **Doug** mentioned that the Committee's concerns were passed on to them as well.

### III. PROGRAM

**Brian** started the first presentation of the meeting: identifying stakeholders in the Thoroughfare Plan adoption process. **Brian** briefly reviewed the purpose of his presentation: to get ideas from committee members on who would be affected by changes in the newly drafted Thoroughfare Plan.

**Brian** then introduced the features of a Thoroughfare Plan in the form of maps and diagrams. **Brian** reminded everyone that the Area Plan Commission has not officially adopted the maps; they were to be used for

reference purposes only. **Doug** added that the maps were in color for easier identification.

**Brian** stated that the Thoroughfare Plan is a part of the Tippecanoe County Comprehensive Plan. The Thoroughfare Plan lays out the road network that would best serve our community. It also identifies different roads according to the function they serve. Local roads serve individual homes and/or businesses; the traffic from these attractions then gets funneled onto collectors, which feed secondary and primary arterials. These arterials then move traffic from one part of the community to another. The Thoroughfare Plan pinpoints roads that would best handle the different levels of traffic. Discussion followed.

**Brian** presented the first map, which is of the urban thoroughfares. When the current Thoroughfare Plan was adopted most of the trips were attracted to the downtown area. **Brian** pointed out that the Thoroughfare Plan also identifies which newly constructed roads would best serve the community.

**Brian** then switched to the map of the rural thoroughfares. The purpose of these roads is to facilitate traffic from the rural areas into the urban area and/or to connect Tippecanoe County with other communities. **Brian** commented on the Hoosier Heartland as an example of a proposed divided primary arterial that will take traffic from Lafayette to Logansport or Fort Wayne.

**Steve** asked whether the Thoroughfare Plan as **Brian** was presenting it was the current one. **Brian** said it was. Discussion followed.

**Brian** said there is another vital function of the Thoroughfare Plan: to require local government or developers to build roads to adequate standards. Such roads can then handle their respective levels of traffic. **Brian** passed out diagrams of what arterials should look like.

**Brian** reviewed the urban arterial cross section with its pavement width, curb and gutter, and sidewalk dimensions. This is in contrast to the rural arterial cross section, which has shoulders and side ditches.

**Brian** then reminded the committee that the Thoroughfare Plan is under revision; this is necessary to ensure that rural roads aren't being built in areas soon expected to urbanize. One of the tasks in this update is to identify those people who would be affected by changes in the Thoroughfare Plan.

**Steve** mentioned that representatives from the various jurisdictions, including City Councils and engineers. **Brian** mentioned that he has had meetings with the City and County engineers to discuss any changes to

the design standards. **Steve** mentioned that CityBus and the different school corporations would be interested as well.

**Brian** mentioned that neighborhood leaders should be included as well. **Steve** added that the major industries should be included because of their truck traffic. Discussion followed.

**Brian** mentioned that the updated Thoroughfare Plan would focus on alternative forms of transportation. **Steve** mentioned other companies involved with transportation issues, such as UPS and Amtrak. **Geneva Werner** mentioned the Post Office. **Sarah Ellison** mentioned the Vision 2020 group. Discussion followed.

**Steve** mentioned that the parks departments and the new Prophetstown State Park should be included. **Brian** mentioned that some proposed roads in the current Thoroughfare Plan are almost completed. Discussion followed.

**Paul** asked about the progress on the Hoosier Heartland. **Doug** replied that it was going slowly. Some design changes have occurred around CR 300N; INDOT is trying to cul-de-sac this road to avoid the expense of a new bridge. **Doug** added that this is not a good idea because of the numerous school buses traveling the road.

**Brian** added that more separation between traffic and buildings is needed on arterials than local roads because of higher traffic volumes. These distances are mandated by the zoning ordinance.

**Brian** then turned the attention to the presentation on the goals of the long-range transportation plan completed in 1978. **Doug** mentioned that Staff is looking to update the information contained in the 2025 Transportation Plan and looking to 2030. Staff needs to look that far ahead to determine the needs of the community, especially for large road projects. Road projects take ten years or more to be completed.

**Doug** prepared a handout of goals and objectives of the transportation study done in 1978. **Doug** reviewed the activities of those who participated in the first plan. First were a series of community input meetings on land use planning. The CPC members also put together a citizens attitude questionnaire to obtain opinions on a variety of issues. In summary, a lot of community input was received for six areas of concern: planning; public facilities and services; environmental considerations; economic growth; residential development; and transportation.

**Doug** mentioned that the goals and objectives of the 1978 plan were then transformed into measures of evaluation. The proposed improvements were then evaluated and ranked by these system measures. Ten system measures were used. Some were: daily travel in vehicle hours; system

efficiency; excess daily demand and capacity; quality of service; and operational costs. Other economic, environmental and social system measures were used as well.

**Doug** briefly reviewed the history of the Transportation Plan; it had been updated in 1991, 1997, and 2001. There was very little citizen input with the last update, but the committee compared it to the original goals and objectives.

**Doug** then read aloud the goal contained in the 1978 Transportation Plan. This goal encompassed interrelated forms of transportation that would create a safe, efficient road network that would enhance economic and environmental opportunities. **Sarah** mentioned the change in name for the Greater Lafayette Area, and also she suggested including future modes of transportation.

**Paul** asked about the future of railroad services. **Doug** replied that Amtrak is still in use but the issue is up for debate. A large push for high-speed rail between Indianapolis and Chicago exists. **Doug** gave ideas about implications of having high-speed rail, such as becoming a bedroom community for Chicago and Indianapolis. Discussion followed.

**Doug** asked if the current goal as written was still valid. **Doug** asked whether the goal should place more emphasis on goods delivery. **Sarah** agreed. **Steve** said that the goal should be general so that no one group is left out. Discussion followed. **Doug** mentioned that the last update was financially constrained and focused on governmental cooperation.

**Doug** then looked at specific objectives: a balanced, multi-model travel network; develop an area-wide transportation network that accommodates present and anticipated travel needs; provide maximum access to area's major activity centers; upgrade, where possible, the capacity of existing thoroughfares; require road projects utilize safety and standards to minimize pedestrian/vehicular conflicts; encourage a travel system that diverts through-traffic from neighborhoods yet maintains accessibility; minimize railroad/vehicular conflicts; and minimize environmental impacts from the transportation system by recognizing social and historical values of the community.

**Doug** reviewed the progress on the above objectives in the last plan update. The last objective looked at not only impacts on wetlands but also minorities and the elderly. **Doug** mentioned that he would like to get rid of as many railroad crossings as possible for safety reasons.

**Steve** mentioned that the concept of bike lanes is not included in any of the objectives. **Margy** asked about the meaning of 'balanced' in the first objective. **Margy** went on to say that when ambiguous terms are clarified, the objectives actually have unintended meanings. Discussion followed.

**Sarah** mentioned that poor planning occurred in the SR 26 corridor from the beginning. **Doug** reminded that access roads were state-of-the-art when that road was designed in the 1970's, but now these roads have caused problems of their own. If access roads are too close to the main road, then safety problems occur at major access points. Discussion followed.

**Steve** mentioned that a smooth traffic flow would make a more efficient travel system. **Brian** said that the current behavior would not support that.

**Margy** mentioned that one nice objective would be to eliminate barriers to other modes of transportation, especially pedestrians. Developments are built without any means of traveling to them without a car. Discussion followed.

**Steve** asked how parking figures into the planning process. **Doug** replied that it is not looked at. Discussion followed.

**Geneva** commented that diverting traffic with new roads usually attracts more development—which attracts more traffic. **Doug** agreed and gave CR 350S as an example. Discussion followed.

**Doug** commented about the prospect of population decline as the 'baby boomer' generation ages. Discussion followed.

**Margy** mentioned that one objective could be to reduce our dependency on automobiles by using greenways or other modes of transportation. This would help in making development more interconnected. Discussion followed.

**Doug** then summarized everyone's comments on the objectives.

#### **IV. QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, OR SUGGESTIONS**

**Doug** reminded people of the next meeting date, moved to the first week of December because of Thanksgiving.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

**Doug** thanked everyone for coming.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Weber  
Transportation Planner